DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 498 HE 031 947

AUTHOR Volkwein, James Fredericks; Parmley, Kelli
TITLE Comparing Administrative Satisfaction in Public and Private Higher Education.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research Northeast Conference (Philadelphia, PA, November 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Administrators; Compensation (Remuneration); Conflict; *Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Job Satisfaction; *Predictor Variables; *Private Colleges; *Public Colleges; Rewards; School Size; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This study examined job satisfaction among administrators in public and private higher education. Data on nearly 1,200 administrators, ranging from directors to presidents, was obtained through surveys of 120 public and private universities. It was found that both public and private higher education administrators were most satisfied with the intrinsic rewards of their positions and least satisfied with the extrinsic rewards and working conditions. However, administrators from private universities were significantly more satisfied than administrators from public universities on the extrinsic rewards dimension (salary, benefits, and promotion). It was also found that, controlling for all other variables, an absence of interpersonal conflict and an atmosphere of teamwork accounted for most of the explained variance in overall satisfaction among both populations. Holding a higher administrative rank was significantly associated with both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction in both groups. In public universities, campus size tended to reduce administrators' satisfaction with the quality of their relationships with others in the work place, while undergraduate quality tended to promote satisfaction in both groups. (Contains 63 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 429 408

COMPARING ADMINISTRATIVE SATISFACTION IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

James Fredericks Volkwein
Director and Senior Scientist
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University
403 South Allen Street, Suite 104
University Park, PA 16801-5252
E-Mail: Volkwein@PSU.EDU

Kelli Parmley
Doctoral Student
AD 241 University at Albany
Albany, NY 12222
(518) 442-5413
E-Mail: kb2437@cnsvax.albany.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Fredericks Volkwein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ABSTRACT

Do administrators in public higher education experience different levels of job satisfaction than their counterparts in the private sector ? Drawing upon the management, higher education, and public administration literature, this study examines a comprehensive array of national data on university characteristics, state characteristics and administrative satisfaction. Such research is important because of the connection in the literature between levels of satisfaction and employee productivity and managerial turnover. The findings suggest that the hypothesized public/private differences are limited to the sub-components of satisfaction reflecting extrinsic rewards and relationships with others. In both sectors, job satisfaction is most consistently linked to work environments characterized by teamwork and low levels of interpersonal conflict.

HE 031 947

The authors acknowledge with appreciation the earlier data collection and database development provided by Shaukat Malik, Office of Institutional Research, SUNY Stony Brook

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparing Administrative Satisfaction in Public and Private Higher Education

The Research and Policy Problem

Much has been written about managerial satisfaction in business and public administration, but most studies in higher education have examined the satisfaction levels of faculty rather than administrators (Austin & Gamson 1983, Gmelch, Lovrich, and Wilke 1984, Cotton and Tuttle 1986, Smart 1990, Olsen 1993, Hagedorn 1994). The few studies of administrative satisfaction in higher education focus primarily on understanding the nature and level of satisfaction, rather than on examining the factors producing satisfaction and the subsequent connections to important outcomes such as turnover and productivity found in the management literature (Solomon & Tierney 1977, Smart and Morstain, 1975, Blix and Lee 1991, Glick 1992).

One important claim in higher education is the connection between autonomy and quality. Previous attempts to empirically measure the relationship between quality and autonomy at the institution level have proved inconclusive (Volkwein 1986, 1987, 1989; Volkwein & Malik 1996, 1997). However, the literature on job satisfaction leads one to expect that autonomy may indirectly effect institutional quality through gains in productivity that result from job satisfaction (Vroom 1964, Porter and Lawler 1968). A previous study of public universities reveals little direct relationship between campus autonomy and administrative satisfaction in public universities (Volkwein, Malik and Napierski-Prancl, 1998). While their study did not examine private universities as perhaps the most extreme examples of autonomy, it found a consistent connection between every measure of administrative satisfaction and the human relations aspect of university administration.

These findings from the higher education literature are consistent with evidence from public administration research that found public professionals deriving their job satisfaction primarily from the social aspects of their jobs and only secondarily, from the work itself (Emmert and Taher, 1992). Additional public administration literature also suggests that job satisfaction varies in significant ways between the pubic and private sector (DeSantis and Durst, 1996; Steel and Warner, 1990). In this regard, it is both reasonable and important to explore the nature and levels of administrative satisfaction in public and private universities in order to understand any important differences that may exist.

Purpose of the Study and Conceptual Frameworks

Do administrators in public and private higher education experience different levels of satisfaction ? Are the influences on administrative job satisfaction similar or different in public versus private universities? This research examines the perceived work environments and individual characteristics of administrative managers in both public and private higher education. In addition to survey data on perceived work environments, we have also incorporated university and state characteristics consistent with a variety of theoretical perspectives from the research literature: organizational theory, structural/functional perspectives, the literature on university autonomy, and theories of employee satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

At the core of this study is the job satisfaction literature. There is general agreement in the literature that job satisfaction is multi-dimensional. Herzberg's Two Factor Theory (1966) draws our attention on the one hand to intrinsic job content factors (such as feelings of accomplishment, recognition, and autonomy), and on the other hand to extrinsic job context factors (such as pay, security, and physical working conditions). Several studies have examined the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction in higher education (Olsen, 1993; Austin and Gamson 1993; Hackman and Lawler, 1971, Kalleberg 1977, Hagedorn 1994).

In addition to agreement in the literature that job satisfaction is multi-dimensional, most studies conclude that satisfaction is influenced by a complex array of personal and situational circumstances (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Hoppock, 1977; Mumford, 1972; Bruce and Blackburn, 1992). Research has shown that several work related variables exert positive and significant influences on administrative satisfaction -- a supportive organizational culture, teamwork, relationships with colleagues and superiors, worker autonomy, and self-fulfillment (Berwick 1992, Bensimon & Newman 1991, Austin & Gamson 1983, Boone 1987, Lawler 1986, Rigg 1992, Volkwein, Malik and Napierski-Prancl, 1998). Most management experts to argue in favor of worker autonomy and organizational flexibility (< biblio >) use Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Job and workload stress exert negative influences on satisfaction and are almost always included in studies of job satisfaction (Blau 1981, Blix & Lee 1991, Glick 1992, Olsen 1993, Hagedorn 1996, Volkwein, Malik and Napierski-Prancl, 1998)

Organization and Environment Perspectives

Perspectives from organization theory emphasize the importance of the organization's structure and its environment (Hall, 1995; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Aldrich, 1979; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). Scholars often divide an organization's environment into economic, political, social, and technological dimensions. Additional research, specifically from studies of colleges and universities, have demonstrated that campus mission, size, wealth, complexity, and selectivity exert significant influences (ranging from small to large) on a variety of college outcomes (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991; Austin & Gamson 1983; Hall 1995). The organizational and environmental literature generally leads us to expect that an array of campus and state characteristics may exert significant influences on administrative satisfaction.

Individual Characteristics

Consistent with research in other organizations, studies of managers in colleges and universities suggest that a variety of personal and organizational variables exert potential influences on their job satisfaction. Among these personal characteristics are physical and mental health, age (Austin, 1985; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Solomon & Tierney, 1977), sex (Austin 1985; Hagedorn 1996), level of education (Martin and Shehan 1989), length of service (Bamundo & Kopelman 1980), administrative rank (Austin & Gamson 1983), and administrative area (Glick, 1992).

Research Methods

Guided by these various perspectives and concentrating on variables potentially important to job satisfaction, we created the analytical database for this study drawing information from a wide range of different sources. This study employs the same methodology as an earlier investigation that examined administrative satisfaction and the regulatory climate at public universities (Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998). The previous investigation collected survey responses simultaneously from both public and private university administrators at cooperating campuses. We added data reflecting campus organizational and environmental characteristics and then engaged in data reduction techniques using principle components analysis and scale building techniques. The resulting variables and scales form the basis for examining the nature of administrative satisfaction in public and private universities.

Target Population, Data Sources, & Variable Summary

Table 1 summarizes the nature of the variables used in this study. Campus characteristics reflecting organizational mission, size, wealth, quality, and complexity are based upon the factor analytic and scale building procedures described in Volkwein and Malik, 1997. Sources for the data include NCES/IPEDS, the National Research Council study of doctoral programs(1995), the Graham and Diamond national study (1996), and the guidebook information contained in Barron's and US News.

Our scale of autonomy and flexibility measures the nature of the external environment at each institution. For public institutions, we use the three-category (high/medium/low) scales developed by Volkwein and Malik (1997). For the separate administrative and academic autonomy dimensions, each campus is classified as high (one standard deviation above the mean), low (one standard deviation below the mean), or medium. This forms the first three categories of a four-category continuum. All private universities are classified as falling in the fourth (or highest) autonomy category.

The respondent characteristics (age, ethnicity, sex, rank, etc.), as well as their reported working conditions, personal stress, and satisfaction levels, are extracted from our survey that was administered by cooperating campus officials to a population of managers at public and private universities. This survey was administered to 12 managers (ranging from vice presidents to directors) on each campus. This survey contains 7 questions about the respondent's background, and 44 items assessing their satisfaction, stress, and working conditions. Using follow-up procedures that guaranteed respondent anonymity, we eventually received an 80% response rate -- about 1200 satisfaction surveys from 120 cooperating public and private universities.

The survey assesses the respondents' work climate and sources of stress on a series of survey items with 5-point response scales. The resulting measures are consistent with those produced by Volkwein et al.(1998), and are summarized in Table 1. Finally, the survey contains 25 satisfaction questions where responses are solicited on a 5-point Likert-type scale from very satisfied (5) to very dissatisfied (1). Congruent with the procedures employed by Volkwein, et

al.(1998), our principal components and data reduction techniques produced four scales in addition to the single "overall satisfaction" measure: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, satisfaction with working conditions, and satisfaction with colleagues and other people one works with. The alpha reliabilities on these four multi-item scales are shown in Table 1 for the two populations. They range from .74 to .90. These four scales plus the single "overall" item are the dependent measures in this study. While the original scales were constructed using a public university population, the alpha reliabilities of the work climate, stress, and satisfaction scales from private university administrators are in most cases even stronger than those in public universities. More information about the psychometric characteristics of these measures can be obtained from the first author.

Tables 2a and 2b show the number of respondent's by functional area and rank, as well as the number of respondent's from public versus private universities. As described in Volkwein et al.(1998), we targeted these managers for the study not because they necessarily represent all university administrators, but because they occupy particular job titles which are potentially influenced by the external environment. These 120 universities are the ones that agreed to participate in the study and they represent approximately half of all the nation's doctoral granting universities. The totals across the tables are not completely congruent because not every respondent completed every item on the survey. The greatest representation of administrative respondents is from the "Director" rank and the "Business and Finance" functional area. Additionally, two-thirds of the respondents are between ages 45 and 60 and 75% are male. Most have a doctoral or masters degree.

Analytic Procedures

The study uses principal components analysis to collapse the survey items into a smaller number of scales that reflect the concepts in the literature and that are congruent with the previous study of public universities. The internal consistency of each scale is tested using Cronbach's Alpha. Once the scales and individual measures were identified, we examined the data using descriptive statistics and compared the responses from those in public versus private universities. We identified five dimensions of administrative job satisfaction. In order to assess any differences in satisfaction between public and private administrators, separate OLS stepwise regression equations were constructed for each of the five types of satisfaction for public and for private universities. This enabled us to examine and compare the influences on each satisfaction dimension identified in the research literature and empirically derived from our survey data.

Results

Do administrators in public and private universities experience different levels of satisfaction? Table 3 compares the public and private university responses on each of the five dimensions of administrative job satisfaction. On four of the five satisfaction dimensions, there are no significant differences in the mean responses and standard deviations of the public and private sector respondents. Both groups are most satisfied with the intrinsic rewards of their positions (3.9 to 4.0 on a 5-point scale). Both groups are least satisfied with their extrinsic

rewards and work conditions (3.2 to 3.5 on a 5-point scale). The largest and only significant difference between the two groups of administrators occurs on the extrinsic rewards dimension (salary, benefits, promotion), where the private university group is significantly more satisfied than the public. Thus, we find differences between the two groups that are smaller than one might expect from reading the literature.

Are the influences on administrative job satisfaction similar or different in public versus private universities? Table 4 shows the results of the multivariate analysis. For each of the five dependent measures the beta weights for the public and private regression models are displayed side-by-side.

The first two columns show the beta weights from the OLS regression models using overall satisfaction as the dependent measure. In both the public and the private models, the largest influence on overall satisfaction is interpersonal conflict, followed by teamwork. In other words, controlling for all other variables, an absence of interpersonal conflict and an atmosphere of teamwork account for most of the explained variance in overall satisfaction among both populations. The private university model is especially robust with an R-square of .39. In the public university model(R-square=.27), two other variables exert a lesser but significant negative influence on satisfaction – a controlled work environment and workload/time pressure.

The second pair of columns in Table 4 presents the results of the intrinsic satisfaction models where the public university model obtained a total R-square of .31 and the private university model obtained an R-square of .40. In both columns the largest beta weight is the negative influence of interpersonal conflict. In the public university model, intrinsic satisfaction is associated additionally with teamwork(.26) controlled work environment (-.17), age(-.11), and rank(-.09). This indicates that respondents are more satisfied if they are in work situations without interpersonal conflict, if they are involved in teams, if they occupy less controlled work environments, if they are younger, and if they have higher administrative rank. In the private university model, intrinsic satisfaction is additionally associated with rank(-.23) with teamwork(.21), and with female(-.18). Thus private university respondents are more satisfied if they are involved in teams, are male, and have a higher administrative rank.

The third pair of columns in Table 4 presents the results of the extrinsic satisfaction models where the public university model obtained a total R-square of .17 and the private university model obtained an R-square of .23, results that are less robust than the other models in the table. The private university model is the least complex in that satisfaction with extrinsic rewards is significantly associated with only two variables: interpersonal conflict and rank. Among these respondents, the absence of interpersonal conflict(-.40) is almost twice as important as a high rank (-.26). In the public university model, extrinsic satisfaction is also associated with rank(-.17) and interpersonal conflict (-.16), but several other variables play a significant role. Among these are undergraduate quality(.12), having a medical complex(.10), female(-.08), highest degree(-.08), being in academic affairs(.13), teamwork(.15), and campus funding(-.12). This indicates again that respondents are more satisfied if they are in work situations without interpersonal conflict, if they are involved in teams, and if they have higher administrative rank.

The fourth pair of columns in Table 4 presents the results of the models for satisfaction with work conditions where the public university model obtained a total R-square of .42 and the private university model obtained an R-square of .54. These are the most robust models in our analysis. In the private university model, satisfaction with working conditions is most strongly associated with interpersonal conflict(-.44), followed by workload and time pressure(-.36) and teamwork(.19). The same variables are significant in the public university model with similar beta weights, but one other variable exerts a lesser but significant negative influence on satisfaction – campus funding. However, the bottom line here is that both public and private university respondents are more satisfied if they are free of interpersonal conflict and undue workload pressure, and are involved in teams.

The fifth and last pair of columns in Table 4 presents the results of the satisfaction models for relationships with others. The public university model obtained a total R-square of .22 and the private university model obtained an R-square of .26. The private university model is the least complex in that satisfaction with the people one encounters on the job is significantly associated with only two variables: interpersonal conflict(-.40) and teamwork(.22). Among these respondents, the absence of interpersonal conflict is almost twice as important as a working atmosphere of teamwork. In the public university model, satisfaction is again associated most strongly with interpersonal conflict (-.29) and teamwork (.19), but several other variables play a significant role. Among these are campus size(-.17), faculty quality(.10), undergraduate quality(.10), having an agricultural college(.08), being in academic affairs(.13), and perceiving a climate of regulation(-.08).

Discussion and Conclusions

This is the first study in higher education to compare administrative satisfaction among public and private university managers. We collected survey data from 1200 administrators ranging from Presidents and Vice Presidents to Directors and Assistants, and derived five dimensions of satisfaction. We found more similarities than differences between the two populations. There are no statistically significant differences between public and private university administrators in the levels of overall satisfaction, satisfaction with intrinsic rewards, satisfaction with working conditions, and satisfaction with the people they come in contact with in their work. Only in the area of extrinsic rewards do private university managers report significantly more satisfaction. Both groups on average are above the midpoint of the 5-point response scale on all five satisfaction dimensions, and both groups report being most satisfied with the intrinsic rewards of their jobs and least satisfied with the extrinsic rewards and work conditions.

While public administration research suggests that there are significant differences between the public and private sectors with respect to levels of satisfaction, there is little evidence in this university population apart from pay and benefits that confirms this hypothesis. Even the satisfaction differences for extrinsic rewards (3.23 versus 3.47 on a 5-point scale), while statistically significant, are hardly dramatic and do not translate into differences regarding overall satisfaction.

In the multivariate analysis we examined the causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Our analysis suggests that work place relationships and an atmosphere of teamwork are almost universally important contributors to every dimension of administrator satisfaction. This finding supports the scholarship that emphasizes teamwork and cooperative work arrangements (Bensimon and Neuman, 1993). It is also consistent with Hagedorn's recent research (1996) showing that interpersonal relationships positively influence job satisfaction and also lessen job-related stress.

Other variables in the study are associated with specific dimensions of satisfaction. For example, holding a higher administrative rank is significantly associated with both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction in both populations. The pressures of workload and time significantly reduce satisfaction with working conditions in both populations. In public universities, campus size tends to reduce administrator satisfaction with the quality of their relationships with others in the work place, and undergraduate quality tends to promote satisfaction in two of the models.

In general, however, few of the campus characteristics seem to influence administrative satisfaction for either population and neither of the two autonomy measures exerts an influence anywhere in the study. This finding contradicts the literature on campus autonomy, but is consistent with the previous study by Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Pancl (1998).

This study does not explore the relationship between job satisfaction and other important outcomes, such as turnover and productivity. However, understanding the nature of job satisfaction in higher education and any significant differences across sectors is an important first step to exploring this question further. Additionally, ample literature on job satisfaction alerts managers in all sectors to the **potential** importance of job satisfaction. In this regard, higher education administrators and policy makers need to consider the implications for job satisfaction as various "reforms" and management techniques find their way into the work place. Clear and consistent evidence from this study and the previous one (Volkwein et al., 1998), indicate the importance of a work environment that is team oriented and free from interpersonal conflict. The sources of stress and conflict in this study include turnover, job security, interpersonal relations with supervisors and colleagues, and lack of personal respect. Efforts to "rightsize" and "restructure" higher education institutions without regard for the effect on work units or teams have potentially dire consequences for the levels of satisfaction, on all dimensions, experienced by administrators.

Table 1 Measures Used in the Multivariate Analyses

Constructs and Variables from Higher Ed Regulation and Job Satisfaction Literature	Nature of the Measure	Cronbach's Alpha Private Univ	Cronbach's Alpha Public Univ	Example of Key items in Each Scale
Campus Characteristics				
Campus Size Campus Wealth Faculty Quality Undergrad Quality Has Medical Hospital Has Agricultural College Flagship Constitutional recognition Campus Age Percent students in dorms Campus rural environment Percent Minority students	Data assembled from a variety of sources and is well documented in two prior publications: Volkwein and Malik (1997) and Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Prancl (1998)			
Autonomy/Flexibility				
Administrative	Categories ranging from least flexible (1) to most flexible (4). Regression beta weights categorized based on standard deviations.			
Academic	Categories ranging from least flexible (1) to most flexible (4). Regression beta weights categorized based on standard deviations.			
Administrator Characteristics				
Age	4 categories from survey			Under 30; 30 to 44; 45-59; 60+
Female	Dichotomous variable; from survey			
Highest Degree	Self identified from survey			Highschool diploma; Baccalaureate; Masters degree; Earned doctorate
Academic Rank	Self identified from survey			Do you have an academic rank?
Administrative Rank	Self identified from survey and categorized in five ranks			
Division	Self identified from survey and translated into dummy variables			Academic; Business & Finance; Human Resources
Perceived Work Climate				
Perceived Regulatory Climate	1 item from survey			This institution experiences more external regulation than most other campuses.
Controlled Work Environment	1 item from survey			The work environment here is more controlled than at most universities.
Perceived Teamwork Commitment	2 item scale from survey	.74	.67	This campus is characterized by an unusual degree of administrative teamwork.
Sources of Stress				
Pressure of workload time	2 item scale from survey --5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress	.80	.74	Time pressure; overwhelming work responsibilities
Personal Health	1 item from survey – 5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress			Personal or family health problems.
Personal Financial	1 item from survey – 5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress			Personal or family financial problems.
Campus Funding	1 item from survey – 5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress			Inadequate funding.
Campus facilities	1 item from survey – 5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress			Inadequate facilities.
Interpersonal Conflict	7 item scale from survey--5 point Likert scale indicating the extent to which this contributed to stress	.79	.76	Conflict with "difficult" individuals; interpersonal relationships with colleagues; turnover on your staff

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 **Measures Used in the Multivariate Analyses**

Dependent Satisfaction Variables				
Relationships with Others	5 item scale from survey-- 5 point Likert scale indicating the level of satisfaction with this aspect of job	.81	.80	Professional relationships with colleagues; relationships with students; social status or recognition
Work Conditions	5 item scale from survey-- 5 point Likert scale indicating the level of satisfaction with this aspect of job	.79	.74	Hours; job security; work pressure stress
Extrinsic Satisfaction	3 item scale from survey-- 5 point Likert scale indicating the level of satisfaction with this aspect of job	.79	.77	Salary & fringe benefits; opportunities for advancement
Intrinsic Satisfaction	8 item scale from survey-- 5 point Likert scale indicating the level of satisfaction with this aspect of job	.90	.89	Autonomy & independence; intellectual challenge; feelings of accomplishment
Overall Satisfaction	1 item from survey-- 5 point Likert scale indicating the overall level of satisfaction with this aspect of job			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2a	*Administrator Satisfaction Survey: Number of Respondents by Rank and Functional Area*					
Functional Area	*Rank 1 Pres, VP, Provost*	*Rank 2 Dean/Assoc. VP*	*Rank 3 Asst. VP*	*Rank 4 Director*	*Rank 5 "Asst to"/Dean*	*Total*
Academic	106	109	6	5	5	*231*
Business & Finance	83	53	49	216	32	*433*
Physical Plant	4	11	18	61	3	*97*
Student Services	2	11	5	164	7	*189*
IR & Planning	6	2	8	61	9	*86*
Human Resources	7	13	14	94	12	*140*
Total	*208*	*199*	*100*	*601*	*68*	*1176*

Table 2b ***Administrator Satisfaction Survey: Number of Respondents by Sector***

Functional Area	*Public*	*Private*
Academic	193	38
Business & Finance	358	77
Physical Plant	83	14
Student Services	155	34
IR & Planning	74	12
Human Resources	115	25
Total	*978*	*200*

Rank	*Public*	*Private*
Rank 1	162	48
Rank 2	162	38
Rank 3	86	14
Rank 4	515	98
Rank 5	62	6
Total	*987*	*204*

** Differences in totals reflect missing data*

Table 3

Mean Differences in Satisfaction Between Public & Private Universtities

Dependent Variable(s) Satisfaction Measures		Public	Private	Mean Difference
Overall Satisfaction				
	Mean	3.90	3.93	-.03
	Std Dev	.80	.87	
	N	992	202	
Intrinsic				
	Mean	3.94	4.00	-.06
	Std Dev	.72	.74	
	N	975	198	
Extrinsic				
	Mean	3.23	3.47	-.24 *
	Std Dev	.90	.90	
	N	983	196	
Work Conditions				
	Mean	3.37	3.35	.02
	Std Dev	.74	.83	
	N	972	203	
Relationships with Others				
	Mean	3.70	3.68	.02
	Std Dev	.65	.67	
	N	976	203	

*Significant at the .001 Level

Table 4 **Regression Beta Weights for Adminstrative Satisfaction Measures**

	Dependent Variables									
	Overall Satisfaction		Intrinsic Satisfaction		Extrinsic Satisfaction		Work Conditions		Relationships with Others	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Independent Variables										
Campus Characteristics										
Campus Size									-.17 **	
Campus Wealth										
Faculty Quality									.10 *	
Undergrad Quality					.12 ***				.10 **	
Has medical/hospital					.10 **					
Has agricultural college									.08 *	
Flagship										
Constitutional recognition										
Campus age										
Percent students in dorms										
Campus rural environment										
Percent minority students										
Autonomy/Flexibility										
Administrative										
Academic										
Administrator Characteristics										
Age			-.11 **							
Female				-.18 *	-.08 *					
Highest degree					-.08 *					
Academic rank										
Administrative Rank			-.09 **	-.23 **	-.17 ***	-.26 **				
Division										
Academic					.13 **				.15 ***	
Business & Finance										
IR &Planning										
Human Resources										
Student Services										
Perceived work climate										
Perceived regulatory climate									-.08 *	
Controlled work environment	-.09 **		-.17 ***							
Perceived adm. Teamwork/commitm	.25 ***	.26 ***	.26 ***	.21 *	.15 ***		.20 ***	.19 *	.19 ***	.22 ***
Sources of Stress on Individ. Adm.										
Pressure of workload/time	-.09 **						-.37 ***	-.36 ***		
Personal health										
Personal Finanacial										
Campus funding					-.12 **		-.06 *			
Campus facilities										
Interpersonal conflict/stress	-.32 ***	-.46 ***	-.34 ***	-.49 ***	-.16 ***	-.40 ***	-.33 ***	-.44 ***	-.29 ***	-.40 ***
Total R-Squared	.27	.39	.31	.40	.17	.23	.42	.54	.22	.26

* = < .05
** = < .01
*** = < .001
Non-significant Beta weights not shown

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Aldrich, H.E. (1979). Organizations and environments. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Atwell, R. H. (1985). "A view from washington." In Gardner, et. al., Cooperation and Conflict. Washington, D. C.: Association of Governing Boards.

Austin, E. A. (1985). Factors contributing to job satisfaction of university mid-level administrators (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: 259626)

Austin, A. E. and Gamson, Z..F. (1983). Academic workplace: new demands, heightened tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 10. Washington DC: The George Washington University.

Bamundo, P.J. and Kopelman, R.E. (1980). The moderating effects of occuaption, age and urbanization on the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 17: 100-123.

Bensimon, E. M. and Neuman, A. (1993). Resdesigning collegiate leadership: teams and teamwork in higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berdahl, R. O. (1971). Statewide coordination of higher education. Washington, D. C: American Council On Education.

Berwick, K.R. (1992). Stress among student affairs administrators: The relationship of personal characteristics and organizational variables towork related stress. *Journal of College Student Development* 33:11-19.

Boone, C.W.(1987). The relationship between job characteristics, role conflict, role ambiguity, internal locus of control, and job satisfaction of college and university adminsitrators. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Denver, 1986. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 47: 2676-A.

Boone, J. N., Peterson, S., Poje, D. J., & Scarlett, M. (1991). University autonomy: perceived and preferred location of authority. *The Review of Higher Education, 14*(2), 135-53.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). Governance of higher education. New York: McGraw Hill.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1976). The states and higher education: A proud past and a vital future. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1980). Three thousand futures: The next twenty years for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1982). The control of the campus: A report on the governance of higher education. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cotton, J.L. and Tuttle, J.M.(1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review* 11:55-70

de Groot, H., McMahon, W., and Volkwein, J.F. (1991). The cost structure of american research universities. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73: 424-431.

DeSantis, V. and Durst, S. (1996). Comparing job satisfaction among public and private-sector employees. *American Review of Public Administration* 26 (3): 327-343.

Downs, A. (1967). Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little Brown.

Dressel, D. (Ed.). (1980). The autonomy of public colleges (New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 26). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Emmert, M. and Taher, W. (1992). Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *American Review of Public Administration* 22 (1): 37-48.

Fisher, L. A. (1988). State legislatures and the autonomy of colleges and universities: A comparative study of legislation in four states, 1900-1979. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2),133-161.

Gardner, J. W., Atwell, R. H., and Bredahl, R. O., eds. (1985). Cooperation and conflict. Washington, D. C.: Association of Governing Boards.

Graham, H.D. and Diamond, N. (1996). The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the postwar era. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hackman, J.R. and Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characterisitics. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 55:259-286.

Hackman, J.R. and Oldman, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 55:259-286.

Hagedorn, L.S. (1994). Retirement proximity's role in the prediction of satisfaction in academe. *Research in Higher Education* 35 (6): 711-728.

Hagedorn, L. S. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education* 37 (5), 569-598.

Hall, R.H. (1995). Organizations: Structures, processes, and outcomes. Englewood Clifffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. (4th Edition).

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: The World Publishing Company.

Hoppock, R. (1977). Job satisfaction. New York: Arno Press.

Kalleberg, A. L., (1977) Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction american *Sociological Review* 42, 124-143.

Lawler, E. E. (1986). High involvement management. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. (1967). Organization and environment. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lee, R., & Wilbur, R. E. (1985). Age, education, job tenure, salary, job characteristics, and job satisfaction: A multi-variate analysis. *Human Relation*. 38(8), 781-791.

Levy, D. C. (1980). University and government in mexico: Autonomy in an authoritarian system.. New York: Praeger.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. IN M.D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 1297-1349.

Millet, J.D. (1984). Conflict in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Mingle, J. Ed. (1983). Management flexibility and state regulation in higher education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Mobley, W.H., Griffith, R.W., Hand, H.H., and Meglino, B.M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin* 86: 493-522.

Mumford, E. (1972). Job satisfaction: A study of computer specialists.London: Longman.

Newman, F. (1987). Choosing quality: Reducing conflict between the state and the university. Washington, D. C.: Education Commission of the States.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How colleges affect students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco. Jossey Bass Publishers.

Pfeffer, J., and G.R. Salancik. (1978). The external control of organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York: harper and Row.

Paul, K.B., Kravitz, D.A., Balzer, W.K., and Smith, P.C.(1990, August). The original and revised JDI: An initial comparison. Paper presented at a meeting of the Academcy of Management Review, SanFrancisco.

Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E., III (1965). Properties of organizational structure in relation to job attitudes and job behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin* 64: 23-51.

Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E., II (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Quinn, R. and Baldi de Mandilovitch, M. (1980). Education and job satisfaction, 1962-1977. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly* 29: 100-111.

Rigg, M. (1992). Increased personal control equals increased individual satisfaction. *Industrial Engineering*, 12-13.

Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education. (1980). A program for renewed partnership. Cambridge: Ballinger Pub. Co.

Scott, R.A. (1978). Lords, squires, and yeomen: Collegiate middle managers and their organizations. ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 7. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Solmon, L. C. & Tierney, M. L. (1977). Determinants of job satisfaction among college administrators. *Journal of Higher Education*, XLVIII(4), 412-431.

Smart, J.C. and Morstain, B.R. (1975). Assessement of job satisfaction among college administrators. *Research in Higher Education* 3: 1-9.

Smart J.C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education* 31 (5): 405-424.

Smith, E., Anderson, J.L., and Lovrich, N.P. (1995). The multiple sources of workplace stress among land-grant university faculty. *Research in Higher Education* 36 (3): 261-282.

Solomon, L. C. & Tierney, M. L. (1977). Determinants of job satisfaction among college administrators. *Journal of Higher Education*, XLVIII(4), 412-431.

Sullivan, S.E. and Bhagat, R.S. (1992). Organizational stress, job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Management* 18 (2): 353-374.

Volkwein, J.F. (1986a). State financial control of public universities and its relationship to campus administrative elaborateness and cost: Results of a national study. *The Review of Higher education, 57* (5), 510-528.

Volkwein, J.F. (1986b). Campus autonomy and its relationship to measures of university quality. *Journal of Higher Education.57*(5), 510-528.

Volkwein, J.F. (1987). State regulation and campus autonomy. In J.C. Smart (Ed.),Higher Education Handbook of Theory & Research,Vol III, (pp.120-154). Agathon Press.

Volkwein, J.F. (1989). Changes in quality among Public Universities. *Journal of Higher Education. 60*(2), 136-151

Volkwein, J.F. and Malik, S.M.(1997). State regulation and administrative flexibility at public unviersities. *Research in Higher Education* 38 (1): 17-42.

Volkwein, J.F., Malik, S.M., and Napierski-Prancl, M. (1998). Administrative satisfaction and the regulatory climate at public universities. *Research in Higher Education* 39 (1): 43-63.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.